



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/669,185	09/23/2003	Justin Won	STL11321	2611

7590 06/29/2005

David K. Lucente
Seagate Technology LLC
Intellectual Property- COL2LGL
389 Disc Drive
Longmont, CO 80503

EXAMINER

OLSON, JASON C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2651

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/669,185

Applicant(s)

WON ET AL.

Examiner

Jason C. Olson

Art Unit

2651

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 13-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 13-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 09/23/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 19 and 20 objected to because of the following reasons: method claims dependent from an apparatus claim. Claims 19 and 20 used method claim terminology and are dependent from a apparatus claim 13. The examiner suggests that claim 19 recite, "The apparatus of claim 17" and claim 20 recite, "The apparatus of claim 13". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-7 and 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Codilian et al. (US 6,707,635).

Regarding claim 13, Codilian teaches a storage medium having at least one recording surface that includes position information (see figure 3, items 26 and 40); a transducer associated with the one recording surface (see figure 3, item 32), wherein a position error signal is generatable when the position information is read by the transducer (see col. 5, ln. 44-46); a moveable assembly upon which the transducer is mounted (see figure 3, item 36), wherein a range of mobility of the moveable assembly allows the transducer to be positioned as necessary

Art Unit: 2651

to allow the transducer to follow a path on the recording surface (see col. 4, ln. 50-55); and control circuitry adapted to estimate repeatable runout by performing actions that include: reading position error signals of the transducer for non-consecutive revolutions to obtain position error signal data (see col. 5, ln. 39-48 and col. 6, ln. 10-13; $N=1$ for the initial number of disk rotations; and combining the position error signal data to obtain an estimate of repeatable runout for the transducer (see col. 5, ln. 48-54).

Regarding claim 14, Codilian teaches reading a position error signal of another transducer for at least one additional revolution of the storage medium wherein at least one additional revolution of the storage medium takes place between the non-consecutive revolutions of the storage medium (see col. 39-50; it is interpreted by the examiner that after a first RRO value set is calculated for a first track or tracks on a first side of the disk based on one disk revolution, RRO is then calculated for a second track or tracks on a second side of the disk, using another transducer, based on at least one additional disk revolution, then RRO is again calculated for the first track or tracks on the first side of the disk based on an additional revolution or revolutions. In this manner, position error signals of the other transducer are read between non-consecutive revolutions of the disk).

Regarding claim 15, Codilian teaches the estimate of repeatable runout for the transducer is obtained by combining the position error signal data additional position error signal data for the transducer (see col. 5, ln. 48-54).

Regarding claim 16, Codilian teaches the position error signal data are combined by averaging (see col. 6, ln. 25-36).

Regarding claim 17, Codilian teaches recording the estimate of repeatable runout for the transducer for use in repeatable runout compensation (see col. 5, ln. 57-63).

Regarding claim 18, Codilian teaches the estimate of repeatable runout for the transducer is recorded on at least one of the recording surfaces (see col. 6, ln. 8-10).

Regarding claim 19, Codilian teaches the estimate of repeatable runout for the first transducer is recorded in a memory (see col. 7, ln. 44-49).

Regarding claim 20, Codilian teaches the control circuitry includes a microprocessor (see col. 7, ln. 2-5).

Regarding claims 1-7: method claims 1-7 are drawn to the method of using the corresponding apparatus claimed in claims 13-20. Therefore method claims 1-7 correspond to apparatus claims 13-20 and are rejected for the same reasons of anticipation as used above.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Chen et al. (US 6,437,936) is cited for RRO compensation using a learning algorithm. Stich (US 5,995,316) is cited for runout cancellation. Nazarian et al. (US 6,141,175) is cited for RRO cancellation.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason C. Olson whose telephone number is (571)272-7560. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 7:30-5:30; alternate Fridays.

Art Unit: 2651

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Hudspeth can be reached on (571)272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JCO

June 23, 2005



DAVID HUDSPETH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600